

## REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Final Office Action dated July 29, 2008, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on October 29, 2008. Claims 1-5, 8-12, 15-17, 19-25 are pending in the application. Claims 1-5, 8-12, 15-17, 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) being unpatentable over Hayes (U.S. 2003/0158906) in view of Connery (US 6,246,683). Claims 22-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayes and Connery in view of known prior art. Claims 22-25 are cancelled.

As amended, claims 1, 9, and 16 each recite limitations of receiving user buffer descriptors that specify the locations of user buffers configured to store processed frame data for delegated TCP connections and indicating how many of the user buffers are accepted by an offload unit. Further, the claims recite that the user buffers are located in a first portion of memory that is allocated to an application program. These limitations are supported by Figure 5B and paragraphs [0062], [0063], and [0071] of the application as originally filed.

Hayes fails to teach or suggest that user buffers are located in a first portion of memory that is allocated to an application program, that user buffer descriptors are received, or that how many of the user buffer are of accepted for delegated connections is indicated. Connery teaches that a single user buffer location is provided to an offload unit. The mechanism taught by Connery provides the offload unit with a user buffer location of a single target buffer for storing payload data received for a particular session (see column 5, lines 28-34 and column 7, lines 29-30). Each packet of the payload data is stored in the target buffer at an offset determined by the sequence number in the packet's header (see column 5, lines 40-47). Nowhere does Connery teach or suggest that the offload unit receives a user buffer descriptor that specifies locations of user buffers for the connection or that the offload unit indicates a number of the user buffers that are accepted, as recited in amended claims 1, 9, and 16.

Claim 11 is amended to recite the limitation of notifying a TCP stack when a threshold value specified for the delegated connection is exceeded, as supported by Figure 9A and paragraphs [0118]-[0119] of the application as originally filed. Both Hayes and Connery are completely silent regarding this limitation.

Regarding claim 15, Applicant fails to find any teaching or suggestion in Hayes related to receiving additional frames while uploading processed frames, as stated by the Examiner. Upon a careful reading of Hayes, no disclosure relating to receiving frames while uploading payload data to legacy buffers or processed frames to user buffers was found. Therefore, Applicant contends that Hayes cannot teach or suggest the limitations recited in claim 15. Connery does not teach or suggest the subject matter of this claim either.

As the foregoing illustrates, no combination of Hayes and Connery teaches or suggests each and every limitation of amended claims 1, 9, and 16. Therefore, amended claims 1, 9, and 16, and claims 2-5, 8, 10-12, 15, 17, 19, and 20, dependent thereon, are patentable over any combination of Hayes and Connery.

#### New Claims

New claims 26 and 27 depend from allowable amended claim 1, new claim 28 depends from allowable amended claim 9, and new claims 29 and 30 depend from allowable amended claim 16. The new claims are therefore patentable over any combination of Hayes and Connery. Claims 26, 28, and 29 each recite the limitation of a sync request flag that controls flushing of existing user buffer descriptors and discarding of new user buffer descriptors for the delegated TCP connection, as supported by paragraph [0097] of the application as originally filed. Claims 27 and 30 each recite the limitations of determining that a threshold value specified for the delegated TCP connection is exceeded and setting a flag in a notification field indicating that the threshold value is exceeded, as supported by Figure 9A and paragraphs [0118]-[0119] of the application as originally filed.

**CONCLUSION**

In conclusion, the references cited by the Examiner, alone or in combination, do not teach, show, or suggest the invention as claimed. Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed. If the Examiner has any questions, please contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Stephanie Winner  
Registration No. 52,371  
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.  
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500  
Houston, TX 77056  
Telephone: (713) 623-4844  
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846  
Agent for Applicant(s)